THEOLOGY

VOL. LX APRIL, 1957 No. 442

Editorial

PROFESSOR GIOVANNI MIEGGE is already known to many English readers on account of his book, *The Virgin Mary: the Roman Catholic Marian Doctrine*,[1] which was generally acknowledged to be an informed, perceptive, and singularly temperate handling of a highly controversial subject. He has now contributed to the series of "World Christian Books" a volume on *Religious Liberty*[2] which, though smaller in size, is marked by the same characteristics. In Britain, because liberty of religion seems to be so securely established, it is not easy to realize how restricted is its range and how precarious are its prospects in many parts of the world. We are also prone to forget how complicated are the questions that the subject poses to an inquiring mind. The English are not much addicted nowadays to this kind of inquiry, but there was a time, not so long ago, when the issues of religious toleration and emancipation were hotly debated among us. The state of the world being what it is, we should not be too complacent about our own constitutional liberality and, in parts of the British Commonwealth, the debate about religious liberty is by no means quiescent or happily settled. Next month we shall be publishing an article about the new situation of the Church in Ghana, as the Gold Coast is to be known now that it has gained its independence.

Unfortunately Christians are not of one mind about the desirability of religious liberty. The Roman Catholic Church still maintains as its "thesis" the traditional idea of the Christian State, i.e. a Roman Catholic State which supports with its authority the Roman Catholic Church and no other and which does not accord liberty to other religions or to other forms of Christianity. This "thesis" can be applied only in countries where Roman Catholics are the dominant majority, as they are to-day in Spain: but it is still the official doctrine that it ought to be applied wherever and whenever Roman Catholics are in a position to apply it. In most countries they are not in a position to apply the "thesis": what they do then is to resort to the "hypothesis", which means that the Roman Church, where it is in a minority, demands a liberty for itself and its own adherents that it is not prepared to grant to others in countries where it can rely on the support of a Roman Catholic government. The "hypothesis" is, as Dr Miegge says, "a subordinate solution, to be substituted for the thesis in cases where it is impossible to put the latter into operation". A considerable number of Roman Catholics are genuinely dissatisfied with the official doctrine of their Church and would like to see the

[1] Reviewed in THEOLOGY, July 1956, pp. 299 f.
[2] Lutterworth Press, 2s. 6d

Vatican once and for all disavow the "thesis". Dr Miegge recognizes "the grandeur and coherence of the Roman Catholic idea" in so far as it represents the demand that "the whole of life in every aspect must be Christian". "Every Christian," he says, "must readily admit that the Christian faith ought to inspire and direct the whole life of man. The point at issue is simply whether reliance on the civil power and its authority is really the best way of attaining the desired end."

Is the only consistent alternative to the Roman Catholic "thesis" the view that religion, since it has nothing to do with the real business of this world, is a matter of indifference to the civil power? This was the view that many Christians were inclined to take in the nineteenth century, but the impact of totalitarianism in this century has made them or their descendants think again. Dr Miegge maintains that there are positive Christian grounds (the reverse of indifferentism) for always desiring and seeking to secure liberty of religion in all countries. Churches should stand for the civil liberties not merely when it suits their interests to do so or on grounds of expediency as in the case of the Roman Catholic "hypothesis", but on grounds of principle. "Religious liberty in the true sense," he says, "is one aspect of the liberty of a conscience directly and personally related to God, and pledged to respect in all other men all those conditions which make such a relationship possible." With great clarity and ample illustration Dr Miegge works out the implications of this principle, and inquires how far in point of fact it is being affirmed or negated in the world to-day—first, in Christian countries, then in the Communist world, and finally in the non-Christian world. We hope that this book will be widely read and reflected upon.

* * * * *

With *The Book of Revelation: a new translation of the Apocalypse*[1] Mr J. B. Phillips has completed his translation of the New Testament into modern English. This volume will not strike its readers as so much of a "revelation" as Mr Phillips' earlier volumes have done. For he has recognized that it would be as impossible as it would be unsuitable to put the Apocalypse into an altogether modern idiom. His translation therefore in this case will be found to be much nearer to the familiar English versions. He has, however, removed a good many archaisms and cleared up some unnecessary obscurities, without destroying the strange and powerful imagery of the original. The cross-headings which are introduced throughout the book are admirably conceived, and will do more to give the general reader clues to its meaning than any drastic departure from the older translations could do. The book is printed in large type and pleasantly invites anyone who supposes he knows the Apocalypse well to read it straight through afresh. We hope, however, that in future editions the typographical conventions of the A.V., R.V., B.C.P., etc., will be followed and that pronouns referring to the Deity will not have initial capitals imposed upon them.

[1] Geoffrey Bles, 9s. 6d.

The Proposed Lectionary

THE floor of the Church is littered with lectionaries in various stages of rejection. The Amended Lectionary of 1944-50 which was for Sundays and Holy Days only was finally rejected by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in October 1955. The authorized and fully legal lectionaries of 1871 and 1922 were threatened with extinction, but were granted a reprieve until the new lectionary (N.L.) of 1955 should have proved its superiority over them. Those who read Bishop Haigh's article in THEOLOGY for April 1956, and perhaps my own article in the *Quarterly Review* for July 1956, may have wondered whether in fact that time would ever come; and conversations with the more thoughtful men among both clergy and readers suggest that this new Table of Lessons is not what the Church needs. It has not been without some external aids. Chief of these has been the widespread desire that one lectionary should be substituted for the profusion which at present exists. Yet another aid has been the speed with which N.L. was rushed through the Canterbury Convocation in 1955. It is interesting to compare the Upper House debate of 2 May 1917 on the Revised Lectionary (R.L)—or "Alternative Table of Lessons", as it was called—with that of 11 October 1955 on the present proposals. The verbatim report of the former covers eighteen pages in the *Chronicle of Convocation*, and the bishops' comments and criticisms were thorough, scholarly, and detailed. No comparable figure for 1955 is possible, since the new Table was only put into the bishops' hands as they entered their House; none of them had any opportunity of examining it, and several said so; and their "approval" of it was, as the President observed, "a vote of confidence in the Committee"—in the Committee, be it noted, not in their lectionary. The York Convocation was perhaps better furnished with the materials for discussion; at any rate, the Bishop of Sheffield was able to make a speech of the same kind of calibre as those which were heard in the Canterbury Upper House in 1917. In particular, he emphasized the vital importance of the matter to the spiritual life of the whole Church and the need of treating it with real deliberation.

There is yet another strange turn of procedure which should be mentioned—the fact, namely, that part of the new Table has been published in almanac form with the high-sounding title, "The Lectionary 1957". Not only does this title suggest that this lectionary holds the field to the exclusion of all others, but it is also gravely misleading in that only half the Two-year Course for Sundays approved by Convocation is here printed. One would have thought that the Joint Committee would in their own interests have ensured that their work should be studied *as a whole*; for it would have made a better showing that way. One cannot help wondering whether the Committee do really wish it to be *studied* at all. Meanwhile, there has been much misunderstanding amongst the clergy.[1]

[1] The present article is based on the assumption that readers of THEOLOGY will, in fact, acquaint themselves with the sole version of the new proposals authorized by Convocation in 1955, which is obtainable from the Church information Board, Church House, Westminster, price 1s. 6d.

What is the first requisite in a Table of Lessons which is to take the place of the Prayer Book Tables of 1871 and the Alternative Table of 1922? The answer to this question is fundamental, for it will determine both the scope and the limitations of the lectionary which is compiled. On the whole, the tendency in the present century has been to lay the emphasis on scope. Our aim, it has been said, must be to provide for as much as possible of the Bible to be read aloud in church on Sundays. Evidence shows that this was in the mind of the 1922 revisers, and passed from them to those who compiled the Amended Lectionary and the new proposals of 1955. It was this, moreover, which led to the plan of a two-year course for Sundays found in the last two. With the late Canon Anthony Deane I was one of the initiators of the Amended Lectionary and served on the Joint Committee which was later formed under the chairmanship of Bishop Haigh. But I daresay that we focused our aim incorrectly and "browned" the covey instead of hitting our bird.[1] What we need in a Sunday Table is that each Lesson shall be sufficiently simple to strike home at the congregation and evoke from it *the response of faith*. No selection of passages for Sunday Lessons can do justice to the whole range and variety of the glories of the Bible: it is only the full lectionary, for week-days as well as Sundays, that can do that. But it is possible to choose passages—more numerous certainly than in 1871, but less numerous than in every subsequent lectionary—which, in seeking to declare the whole counsel of God, will "stab the spirit broad awake" each time. A good proportion of it will consist of the great stories in which the Old Testament especially abounds. And all this points to what the clergy and readers would assuredly prefer, a one-year course.

No doubt this will mean some alternatives—and why not, so long as they conform to the standard called for by the response of faith? I cannot understand the aversion to alternatives which is alleged to exist to-day. They can be most instructive, and have had a place in every lectionary since 1871. They may relate different incidents, for example, from the story of the same man, an Abraham or an Elijah; or balance one form of Creation doctrine by another, the divine transcendence of Genesis 1 by the immanence of a divine Mediator in Proverbs 8 (or Wisdom 7); or provide in 2 Kings 6, 8–23 or 2 Chronicles 28. 8–15 alternative lessons on mercy towards defeated enemies, which seem to foreshadow the parable of the Good Samaritan. I fear, though, that the reason for the Joint Committee's objection to them is that they leave the clergy an element of freedom. It is part of the policy of tying everything up so tight that there shall be no loose ends, no place for choice. One can safely say that the better and more thoughtful men amongst the clergy and readers will resent the imputation which such a policy implies.

The second requisite in a lectionary is that it shall have some *design*. It should not only rest, but should be seen to rest, on some general plan or principle which governs its sequences. Ostensibly the

[1] On the other hand the frequent provision made for a Lesson to be read in a longer or a shorter form was an admirable feature of A.L. and should be retained.

design both of the 1922 lectionary and of the new proposals which are a revision of it, is the ecclesiastical year—or rather (to quote the original resolution passed by the Canterbury Lower House in 1913) "the adoption of the Ecclesiastical weeks in preference to the Calendar months as a framework for the Church lectionary". The whole phrase is a curious one, and refers not to the principles on which the lectionary is framed, but to the way in which it is presented. The Prayer Book lectionary, for example, is not governed in any way by the Calendar months but by the days of the year, with Propers for Sundays and Holy Days. The "ecclesiastical weeks" are not the Church's seasons, but simply a method of enumeration. There is nothing seasonal, for example, in the Lessons set in R.L. or in N.L. for Epiphany or for Lent. The only "ecclesiastical weeks" in the year which lend themselves, in whole or in part, to seasonal treatment for lectionary purposes are Advent, Holy Week and Easter Week, Ascensiontide and Whitsun Week: for the rest of the year the phrase has little meaning.

Nevertheless, though it has little meaning, it has been the cause of great confusion. Examples are numerous. One is the cardinal difficulty of fitting into a Calendar with a movable Easter a scheme which cries aloud for a fixed Easter—a point to which striking reference was made by Dean Kirkpatrick of Ely when introducing R.L. into the Canterbury Lower House in 1917. Another was the construction of a "harmony" of the Synoptic Gospels for Evensong on weekdays during the ten weeks after Trinity. The Joint Committee have rightly seen that this was a blunder, but their efforts to replace it have only led to other anomalies elsewhere. Yet other examples, common both to R.L. and N.L., are the unhappy interruption of the reading of St Matthew in the early months of the year by as much as three or even four weeks, when Easter is late, and the fact that in many years (according as Easter falls) the Acts of the Apostles will begin to be read not at the beginning but at Chapter 15. And over all these things there hangs what may be called the tyranny of Septuagesima. No one will wish to alter the custom of reading the narratives of the Creation on this day; but to make this Sunday, which appears to have first claimed observance at Rome about the 7th century (cf. *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 206), the keystone of the whole lectionary, for weekdays no less than Sundays, seems to be an extraordinary procedure.

The true inference to be drawn from these anomalies is surely that the difficulties of using the "ecclesiastical weeks" as the "framework" and indeed the foundation of a lectionary, in defiance of Easter being movable, are too great to be overcome. The results of such a process, moreover, are disastrous. Not only is the clear design of the Bible itself, which is familiar to all and the reasons for it known to many, thrown to the winds throughout much of the year; but the reconstruction of the pieces into which it is divided and the attempt to fit them into a mould for which the Scriptures were never written, open the way to every kind of arbitrariness, artificiality, and pedantry. "The Word of God is not bound", said St Paul; but here it is, bound in every joint and limb, trussed up like a chicken and filleted like

a fish, so that the original lineaments of Holy Scripture are effectively concealed. We are back to "the number and hardness of the rules called the Pie", referred to in the second part of the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer. The case may be illustrated from an episode in the story of Winchester Cathedral. The glass in the great west window was shattered to pieces by the Puritans in Cromwell's time. What the design of the glass was we do not know; but the pieces were carefully collected and kept and were re-inserted at the Restoration if not a little earlier. The whole was last releaded in 1921 when some of the pieces were turned inside out and perhaps rearrangd. The result is a window without any general design but with a few small patches of it here and there. Many of the individual quarries have great beauty of colour and serve as a guide to us to-day when any fresh colour is introduced into the cathedral. But none can pretend that a window without an overall design is satisfactory. The lectionary makers of 1922 and 1955 had less excuse than our glaziers, for there was and is a general design available in the Bible itself.

And it is to the Bible itself and its order that we must return. I do not know what induced the revisers of 1913–22 to pursue the will-o'-the-wisp of "ecclesiastical weeks". The actual criticisms of the 1871 lectionary which were voiced at that time had little to do with it. These criticisms were universal and definite; and they were mainly concerned with the inadequate provision made in those Tables for Proper Second Lessons on Sundays and (to a lesser degree) on Holy Days. Had they started there, they would have avoided all the difficulties caused by a movable Easter, and would also have discovered that it is far easier to supply what is lacking in a lectionary than to construct one almost *de novo*. There would have been no need to prejudge issues on which biblical scholars are not agreed, such as the "chronological" order of the Minor Prophets or the Epistles of St Paul; still less, to shift between the chronological and the biblical order, when some concurrence of lessons seemed to our modern precisians to demand it. Above all, they would have had in the weekday Table of 1871 and in the Old Testament Lessons for Sundays a *ground-bass* which gave to the whole course continuity, meaning, and rhythm. There would be some loose ends, perhaps; but if one has to sell one's soul either to a pedlar or a pedant, most people would choose the pedlar every time.

Finally, it is important to consider how far a lectionary is adaptable to being printed in full and bound up with the Book of Common Prayer. The question is fundamental; for there is no book of devotion more widely used in the Church, by clergy and lay-folk alike, than the Daily Service Book, and none more intrinsically precious. No one will dispute that the Daily Service Book which contains the Prayer Book Lectionary is admirable for this purpose—modest in size and price, printed in good type, and with the lectionary so arranged that the user can find a particular biblical passage at any time easily and quickly. The Daily Service Book which contains R.L. is less satisfactory on all these counts; and though the whole Table of Lessons is printed at the end of the lectionary, it is by no

means convenient for purposes of reference. The case with N.L. will be inevitably worse, since it will be still larger. A Proctor speaking in the York Convocation in October 1955 (the Rev. B. A. Smith) estimated that a new office book would run to "1,100 pages, double column, very close type of printing", and he reckoned that the cost would be £3, or more probably £5. I am informed by a member of the Joint Committee that this difficulty was not overlooked, but that it can be surmounted by the provision of a system of cross-references. Such a system would surely be complicated, and therefore baffling; and that is the last thing in the world which is wanted in a book of devotion. It would be, indeed, yet another example of the return of the *Pie*. For what church-people call for is not complication but simplicity—a lectionary which will really be to them *the Bible in Church*.

E. G. Selwyn.

History and Revelation

I

"What happened 1,900 years ago . . ." What really did happen? That is the question which we are left with if we reject Origen's refusal to take history with the seriousness which the Bible demands. If we attach to history this crucial, critical significance, this means that Christianity is vulnerable to history. Origen would not have allowed this. This is, I believe, where he is most open to criticism. But if we do allow it, where do we find ourselves? We are to-day very far from the nineteenth-century view which believed that history was a simple, straightforward field of study, a matter of finding out the facts and then publishing them. We have neither to deal with those over-confident Christians attacked by Kierkegaard, who were sure that the truth of Christianity could be established by reliable, objective, historical proofs, nor with the equally confident sceptics, like Samuel Butler, who were quite certain that Christianity had been finally disproved by historical investigation. Event and interpretation in history are so subtly interwoven that we can say neither that interpretation is all and event an insignificant and malleable ingredient of history (as George Orwell suggests in *1984*), nor that history consists of autonomous, objective facts capable of being wholly explained by scientific investigation.

I confess to what may seem a naïve conviction that it is wrong to despair of history, that "facts are sacred", that involved in our belief in God is an obligation to submit our views to the discipline of historical evidence, even though I see clearly that this is not all that there is to be said about the interaction of revelation and history. If I am required to believe in a doctrine alleged to be connected with an historical event, I still expect some colourable historical evidence deriving from a period quite near the supposed event itself. But it is undeniable that what we call historical facts, especially historical facts in ancient history, events which happened more than 1,500 years ago, have about them a most disconcerting ambiguity. Consider,

for instance, the Elephantine Papyri. These are papyrus sheets written in Aramaic, discovered about the turn of the century, pertaining to the affairs of a colony of Jewish mercenaries established on an island in the Upper Nile. They cover several periods of the fifth century B.C. They mention the god Yahu, the priesthood at Jerusalem, Sanballat the Governor of Samaria, and the Festival of Unleavened Bread. What a priceless treasure for the historian! Authentic contemporary written sources independent of the Old Testament! Just what the historically minded biblical theologian would have asked for! And yet how much reliable information have they given us? How much light have they in fact thrown upon the religion of the Jews in the fifth century B.C.? The answer is, very little. They have served to make darkness a little more visible, to remind us disturbingly of how much we do *not* know.

We cannot absolutely disprove any allegedly historical fact. It cannot be absolutely disproved, for instance, that Julius Caesar, as many of his contemporaries asserted, relying on early evidence, was assumed into heaven. By the same argument we cannot absolutely prove any historical fact. We cannot absolutely prove the historical existence of Jesus Christ. In refusing to follow Origen in avoiding the cruciality of history, in refusing to agree that what matters most is, not the event, but the truth shadowed forth by it, we seem to have exposed our faith to all the uncertainty, all the relativeness, of historical knowledge. And the further we travel down the stream of time from the event which we have determined to regard as so crucial, the dimmer, the more uncertain will apparently become our knowledge even of this event. The avalanche of history happening in between is apparently bound to bury this event ever deeper and deeper away from us. Historical certainty diminishes to vanishing point over the distant horizon of the centuries. How are we to escape from this impasse?

II

It is interesting to take a brief glance at two solutions to this difficulty which have been suggested. At the beginning of his *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, Kierkegaard insists again and again that a purely historical faith in Christianity is no faith at all, that it rests upon a relative uncertainty, and that nothing whatever of importance in Christianity can be established by historical proofs. In this work and elsewhere he offers as his solution the conviction that, rejecting all objectivity, we can in an act of faith characterized by what he calls passionate subjectivity become contemporaries of Jesus Christ, or rather find that Jesus Christ is contemporary with us. All history that is not "history *for you*", all history in which the thinking subject has not an infinite personal concern, is irrelevant and worthless. The thirty years of the history of Jesus Christ are history *for you*, history in which each of us is deeply concerned. But the rest—eccleciastical history, Councils, Confessions, Crusades, Reformations, and so on—he seems to reject as having nothing to do with Christian faith.

We can sympathize with this drastic solution, but I do not think that we should adopt it without modification. Certainly we must agree that Christian faith is not just a matter of appealing to the obvious facts of history, either to the history of the Church conceived as the working out of a divine or cosmic principle in the mechanism whereby the universe works, as the Hegelians did, or to the history of the life of Jesus, as the liberal theologians of the early decades of this century did. We must allow Kierkegaard's point that Christian faith, and with it the Christian view of history, involves what he calls inwardness or subjectivity, self-committal, risk, "floating upon 70,000 fathoms of water". But must not part of that inwardness, that passion, that wrestling, which is faith, be a painful dealing with and acceptance of the apparently inescapable facts of history? This is an ingredient of inwardness which Kierkegaard seems to me, in a most unkierkegaardian fashion, to take too easily for granted.

Again, Kierkegaard was an individualist. Not only did he see no point in the Church—the empirical Church as he knew it anyway—but he positively rejected it and spent the last few years of his life attacking it violently and on his death-bed deliberately refused communion with it. But in considering the interaction of revelation and history we have no right to ignore the Church. In the New Testament the Church is the place where history and supra-history, divine history and human history, meet, the situation in which the God-man, who is at the centre of the meeting, chose to dwell. The Church is part of the encounter of the divine life with history. We cannot possibly be fully Scriptural, we cannot take full account of the essential features of our problem, if we ignore the Church. And if this is so, we cannot escape taking some account of the history of the Church, with all its paraphernalia of Councils and Reformations. The only alternative would be to make an absolute separation between the empirical Church and the ideal or invisible Church, and this would bring us into even greater difficulties.

The other solution of the problem worth glancing at is that of the school of Rudolf Bultmann, associated with the attempt to demythologize the gospel. I can judge it only from the little that I have read about it and from a recent broadcast consisting of a very good sermon preceded by a very odd introduction. Its contention seems to be that the one question which we must not ask about any event in connexion with the Christian dispensation is, "Did it really happen?" No writer of the New Testament apparently would have asked this question, or would have thought it one relevant to the propagation of the gospel. What we ought to ask is, whether the event, or alleged event, mediates an existential encounter with Christ, which is at the same time an encounter with God. This is the only satisfactory test to apply to what old-fashioned people would call Christian evidence.

At first sight this solution is like Kierkegaard's, and it certainly is to some extent influenced by his work. But in fact it proceeds from quite different grounds and motives from Kierkegaard's. His convictions arose from dissatisfaction with the shallow confidence in Christianity as an historical phenomenon displayed by his contem-

poraries. Bultmann's views proceed from a despair of the reliability of any historical facts about Christianity and are therefore in fact quite different from Kierkegaard's. This despair of history, characteristic of more than one tendency in theological thinking to-day, I profoundly suspect. I have no objection to demanding from every Christian an existential encounter with Christ. But it must be involved with the historical Christ. Any other solution smacks of Gnosticism, that corruption which Bultmann himself is so ready to attribute to the early Church.

Besides, it is unrealistic to ignore history, even ecclesiastical history. History is what has made the situation in which we live; in large part it has made us, and we cannot escape from it. Men would not be now trying to escape from history if history had not shaped and composed them. And even if the scholars ignore history, others will not ignore it. History—usually history misunderstood—is a powerful dynamic and a powerful spell. It drives peoples mad with nationalism. It makes revolutions and smashes the fabric of mighty societies. If we are to persuade men, we must have some way of interpreting two thousand years of past history. We cannot simply tell them to ignore it by an act of faith or tell them that history does not matter. This would not be far from Origen's solution of encouraging Christians to transcend history and move into a timeless realm to which history is only an antechamber.

III

I cannot pretend that the suggestion which I now offer represents a thorough thinking through of this problem, still less that it is a cut-and-dried solution of it. But I have a presentiment that a hopeful new approach has been opened, not so much to the question of how to determine "what really happened" in history, as to the difficulty of conceiving how a period of apparently dead and gone history of remote antiquity may in fact be perennially relevant, active, and contemporary. This approach has been opened by the works of some contemprary scholars who have made a special study of the Hebrew conception of time. I refer to Oscar Cullmann's *Christ and Time,* which distinguishes between "redeemed" and "unredeemed" time; John Marsh's *The Fullness of Time,* with its investigation of the meaning of infinite time (*òlam*) in the Bible; and above all a book by a Norwegian scholar, Thorlief Boman, called *Das hebräische Denken im Vergleich mit dem griechischen,* whose second edition has just appeared though it has not yet been translated into English. Boman points out that our Western, European, Greek conception of time in spatial terms, as a line in the middle of which we stand with the past behind us and the future in front of us, is an artificial, scientific construction which does not necessarily convey reality to us and is not in fact very satisfactory. He labels this "physical-astronomical time". With this he contrasts "psychological-historical time", which is time in the Hebrew conception of it. The Hebrews did not think of time as a line or as a circle, or indeed in any geometrical or mathematical way at all. They thought of it as a rhythm consisting of significant

time alternating with insignificant time, what Cullmann would call redeemed time varying with unredeemed and Marsh filled time varying with empty time. What mattered to the Hebrews about time, what they measured time by, was not the duration of it, but its quality, its content. Time was therefore either active, significant, real, or the reverse. They thought of it, as they thought of everything, in dynamic, subjective, personal terms. And they did not think of the future as in front of us and the past behind us. They conceived of each individual as journeying forward through his life from cradle to grave in company with the whole human race. The whole race is moving towards where its ancestors have gone, into the past. The future overtakes it from behind, and the future generations are those who come *after*. The past therefore is in front and the future behind, because the subject, from whose point of view time is conceived, is moving forward into the past. This conception of time, says Boman, is quite as real, and quite as satisfactory, as the other. In many ways, indeed, it is more satisfactory, because it seems to correspond to the facts of human psychology and human history. It is possible that during the next generation theologians will produce a satisfactory account of the interaction of divine redemption and human history from materials such as these. This way of approach certainly relieves us, in considering the question, from the pressure of the centuries, because it renders irrelevant the duration of time between the era of revelation and to-day. Those thirty years were the supremely filled, supremely active, supremely redeeming time, the time in which God supremely acted, and they are therefore contemporary with us, to speak in Greek terms, they are eternal, *aionioi*; or rather, the fact that they are not, from the durational point of view, contemporary is irrelevant. Similarly, to the Jew of the Old Testament the Exodus, including the crossing of the Red Sea and the Wandering in the Wilderness, though they had taken place long, long ago, were immensely relevant, active, significant, indicative of God's activity in the present as well as in the past.

This line of approach does not indeed relieve us of the relativity of historical evidence. Nothing can do that, nothing can deliver us into a world of unshakeable certainty untouched by the relativity of all human decisions. But then Kierkegaard has, I think, shown that it is a mistake to desire such a deliverance. By this way of approach the Christian hisorian has at least a new question to ask of history, other than the question of whether the event happened or not. He has a new standard or canon by which he judges history; is it living, filled, active time, or not? He is still at the mercy of history, he does not try to evade it, as, I think, Origen tended to do. But he is asking of the historical period which he is studying only that it shall provide the material for God's fulfilling activity, that it shall not contradict the pattern of a crisis, that it shall be the background upon which God has acted decisively.

I do not think that this way of approach necessarily excludes the significance of ecclesiastical history. The Church is the community created by, created for, the fulfilled time, the supremely significant

time. It lives in two times, fulfilled time and durational time, and its manner of living in the second determines whether it is living up to, "reckoning itself alive" in, the first. No matter how long ecclesiastical history goes on, through all its cavalcade of Councils, schisms, and reformations, it cannot escape from the crisis of that fulfilled time. That ever relevant time supplies the Church's various historical vicissitudes with significance, for good or for bad, just as the Old Testament prophets constantly insisted upon judging the Jewish nation by God's activity towards them manifested in the time of the Exodus, or, to a lesser degree, in the time of the Exile. Ecclesiastical history is significant, but only in the light of the history of revelation.

R. P. C. HANSON.

Celibacy[1]

". . . And there are eunuchs which made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."—Matt. 19. 12.

I WANT to speak plainly, without apology, and at some length on a matter which I believe to be too rarely talked of. What that matter is has already been made clear in my text.

The call to the unmarried state is a true and proper vocation. To that I imagine most of our fellow-churchmen would be prepared to assent, though some might suspect that a celibate can be neither quite normal nor completely at home in the Church of England.[2] At any rate it is a vocation which is often misunderstood; and misunderstandings are increased by any conspiracy of silence about it. Nor can any man give fair consideration to this as a possible vocation unless he takes pains to discover what is to be said for it and about it. That is why I am speaking about it, for I have no doubt that it is to this that some of you will be called. For those whose vocation is different this address can be of no more than academic interest; but the matter is too important to be allowed on their account simply to go by default. I can only ask their indulgence.

Two preliminary points should be made. First, celibacy is a *vocation*. The call and grace to respond to it both come from God. Comparisons with other equally valid but different vocations are irrelevant. If it be in any sense a *higher* vocation than others (as some have maintained), those who receive it can claim no credit on that score. Secondly, it is, obviously, a *minority* vocation.

Yet there are some who will claim that to make these preliminary assumptions is to beg the whole question. For the whole question is, Can celibacy ever be regarded as a valid vocation—as a state of life to which God who is Goodness and Love could ever conceivably call any man or any woman? Here, indeed, is the crux. Unless celibacy

[1] An address in Cuddesdon College Chapel.

[2] I heard recently of a prominent church dignitary who expressed the view that he was usually suspicious of any clergyman who was not married by the time he was thirty!

can be firmly grounded in theology no considerations of expediency, no urgent calls for more unmarried priests to meet desperate needs, will carry much conviction. There are those who urge in good faith that celibacy has no such theological justification. It is then on the theological level that the matter must first be considered.

The claim is sometimes made (and still more frequently implied) that the married state is so grounded in the order of creation, so woven into the very fabric of the universe, as to be the only proper and natural condition for all men and women. Those who through misfortune or their own fault miss wedlock must put up with an existence essentially unnatural and incomplete, at best a *pis aller*, at worst a tragic mistake. It is for marriage that God created all men and all women. Common sense and the Creation narrative, explicitly endorsed by our Lord, make this abundantly clear. "And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."[1]

Before going any further we must remember an important distinction which though generally acknowledged in theory is often forgotten in practice. This is the fundamental distinction between the *order of creation* and the *order of redemption*. It may well be that in the order of creation wedlock was (so to say) God's original purpose for all mankind. But it is the order of redemption in which we are inextricably involved and with which we must therefore be concerned. We must surely maintain, in all humility and reverence, that in the fallen world—in the order of redemption—some modifications of God's original purposes have been necessary. There is, for example, no self-evident absurdity in the Scotist contention that incarnation has ever been within the original purpose of God, that the Word would have become flesh even had man never sinned. But we cannot easily believe that the Cross would have had a place in an unfallen world. We do not doubt that Calvary was within the providence of God; but that it was within his original purpose we can hardly believe. It has its place in the order of redemption, but not in that of creation.

The pattern of redemption is the pattern of renunciation. It is precisely because Christianity is redemptive that it is, in von Hügel's words, "centrally a religion of renunciation, of heroism".[2] God's original purpose for a world unfallen may well have been universal wedlock; but it does not follow that it is necessarily or even probably his purpose for the world we know, a world in which the process of redemption and the practice of renunciation are clearly inseparable. We shall expect that although he will still call many to marriage, he will also call some to renounce it. This supposition is powerfully endorsed by the teaching of Christ himself. His quotation from Gen. 1. 27,[3] to which reference has been made, was elicited, as Mark and Matthew agree, by a question of the Pharisees about divorce: "They said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement and to put

[1] Gen. 1. 27=5. 2 (P), cp. Mark 10. 6=Matt. 19. 4.
[2] *Essays and Addresses*, II, 94.
[3] Mark 10. 6=Matt. 19. 4.

her away. But Jesus said unto them, For your hardness of heart he wrote you this commandment. But from the beginning of creation, male and female made he them." His reply is concerned simply with the case of those who are married. He is in no way concerned here with the question whether or not all men should marry. No answer express or implied to that quite different question can be read into his words.

To another very different problem posed, again with malicious intent, by the Sadducees he answered: "When they rise from the dead they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as angels in heaven."[1] Some find in these words a suggestion that celibacy is a higher vocation than marriage. At any rate they suggest that marriage is a temporary relationship and not an eternal one. They certainly do not support the view that wedlock is the only proper vocation.[2]

To a fellow-guest at supper who once remarked, perhaps too easily and glibly, "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of heaven", Christ replied with the parable of the great supper, with its tale of good excuses which were not good enough. Among those excuses was that of the man who said: "I have married a wife and therefore I cannot come."[3] The man took it for granted that the adequacy of his excuse was self-evident, but the clear teaching of the parable is that it was not. There are some obligations with which even matrimonial responsibilities may not be allowed to interfere. Nor is this just a piece of counsel addressed to a particular individual; St Luke records that it was part of Christ's public preaching: "Now there went with him great multitudes: and he turned, and said unto them, If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."[4] There is nothing here to suggest that in Christ's estimation marriage is the only proper course for all men.

It is, however, in the words which I took as my text that we find the bluntest and most unequivocal statement on this matter. "But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, but they to whom it is given. For there are eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are eunuchs, which were made eunuchs by men: and there are eunuchs, which made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake."[5] That these strong words are found only in St Matthew gives us no grounds for doubting that they are a genuine dominical utterance; there is no inconsistency here with what he says elsewhere on this subject. If we may not interpret this text with the literalism of Origen, neither may we just explain it

[1] Mark 12. 25=Matt. 22. 30=Luke 20. 35.

[2] To those who are married the suggestion that marriage is not an eternal relationship must seem a very hard one. I think the hardness disappears if we believe that heaven will involve so perfect a relationship with *all* as is incompatible wih an exclusive relationship with *any*.

[3] Luke 14. 20.

[4] Luke 14. 25, 26, cp. Matt. 10. 37, 38.

[5] Matt. 19. 11, 12.

away as a Gnostic interpolation. We cannot believe that it means anything less than that some people have a valid vocation to celibacy, voluntarily embraced by God's grace in order that they may take their particular share of his work.

In this, as in all else, there is perfect consistency between Christ's preaching and his practice, for he did not himself embrace that holy estate which he adorned and beautified with his presence in Cana of Galilee. The celibate life of the Redeemer himself cannot but suggest that some at least of those who are called to share his redeeming work will also be called and empowered to share this particular incident and circumstance of it.

This has always been the teaching of the Catholic Church; and it is still the teaching of that part of it which is the Church of England. In the sixteenth century our forefathers rightly repudiated as unscriptural and unreasonable the requirement that *all* members of the clergy should abstain from marriage; but Article XXXII "*of the Marriage of Priests*" is far from suggesting that *none* of them should: "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons are not commanded by God's Law either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage. . . ." A member of the clergy *may* marry, like anyone else; but the discretion rightly allowed him on this point must be informed by a consideration of the nature and demands of his ministry, and the manner in which he is likely best to discharge it to God's glory and men's salvation. ". . . Therefore it is lawful for them as for all other Christian men to marry at their own discretion as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness." For some the proper use of that discretion and the due discharge of their own vocation will mean marriage; for others it will mean abstention from it "for the kingdom of heaven's sake".

It cannot be too strongly insisted that the proper exercise of this discretion is one of the greatest responsibilities which those who are called to the Sacred Ministry must face. Upon it depends, perhaps more than upon any other single circumstance, the discharge of a man's vocation—the fulfilment, or the frustration, of his own life and of the lives which are bound up with his. Any marriage taken in hand unadvisedly, lightly, or wantonly can scarcely avoid being disastrous; such a marriage undertaken by a priest is often doubly so inasmuch as the frustration, the disillusion, and the despair which it propagates tend to be even more far-reaching and profound. Yet it cannot be denied that such marriages are far from uncommon. "I believe it to to roughly true," wrote Bishop Hensley Henson "that 50 per cent. of the married clergy were undone by their wives, and 50 per cent. were made by them."[1]

I wonder how many of us would be prepared to quarrel with his estimate? But of such sad things no more need be said. It is important only that we in our generation should do all we can, by God's grace, to use our own discretion aright in so great a matter. What guidance, if any, is it possible to give?

[1] *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, I, 280.

May I make three suggestions which may perhaps do something to assist your reflections upon this matter? They can be shortly and simply summarized: (i) Take your time; (ii) look to yourself; (iii) look to the situation.

(i) *Take your time.* Do your best not to think overmuch about marriage just yet, either while you are here or in your first parish where temptations to an ill-advised marriage may be very considerable. Be on your guard against idle dreams and fancies by giving your minds wholly—as at this stage they should be given—to learning more of the meaning of God's work to which you are called. Avoid that very common preconception that, whatever God intends for other men, he intends marriage for you. And be very careful indeed lest situations or relationships so develop that you find yourself involved in commitment to marriage before you have had a real chance of learning the meaning of commitment to priesthood. Take your time. Do not be over anxious to discover a wife before you have learned the rudiments of the ministry you will expect her to share. "I have never at any time opposed clerical matrimony in principle," writes Bishop Hensley Henson again, "but I have always urged that men ought to give their first ten years in orders to hard work."[1] That is perhaps a hard and unpalatable remark; it was made in 1903. But think twice before you dismiss it as out of date. It is no answer to say that things are very different to-day, that it is the current fashion to marry much younger. It is after all no part of any Christian vocation to follow the way of the world. Take your time. God may call you to marriage; but it is, I believe, unlikely that he will call most of you to it just yet. He may never call you to it at all. Do not run the risk of prejudging the issue.

(ii) *Look to yourself.* Self-knowledge, that difficult and humiliating process, gives us many a clue both as to the sort of work God wants of us and to the circumstances in which he expects us to attempt it. If you are to decide rightly about marriage you cannot ignore your own particular temperament and aptitudes. What kind of person are you? Are you really the sort of person who will be able to love God and a wife without failing either? To reconcile the claims of Christ and a family? Can you, being the person you are, do real justice to both? There are many who can, for that is their vocation. There are others who know that they cannot; for it is *not* their vocation, and for them to attempt it would be tragically to fall between two stools. And, again, what of your particular aptitudes? They, too, are pointers which you ignore at your peril. What kind of work do they suggest for you? A genius for languages may suggest an obvious aptitude for work in Korea or Central Africa, and seem more likely to suggest a possible vocation to celibacy than gifts which will find their proper fulfilment in the service of an English parish. Look to your temperament. Look to your aptitudes. They will not give you straight answers, but they will give you some clues. Look to yourself.

(iii) *Look to the situation*—at the challenge which confronts the

[1] *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, I, 77.

Church militant to-day at home and overseas. The challenge to the Church militant in this as in every age is to go forward. And the forward troops of the army of Christ, the spearhead of its advance, must always be men who can travel light, who can travel anywhere, at any time; they must be men without responsibilities except to God alone. The Church always requires a certain proportion of unmarried priests for the prosecution of her warfare; and overseas bishops and hard-pressed incumbents at home, C.A.C.T.M. memoranda and missionary magazines, unite to proclaim that we have not got enough of them now. If the shortage of priests is acute, the shortage of unmarried priests is more acute still.

Take your time. Look to yourself. Look to the situation, with its challenge and its demands. And then give yourself anew to God's service without reservations or preconceptions, for sickness or for health, for life or for death, for wedlock or not for wedlock, for time and for eternity. That is your vocation and mine. And if *you* should be one of those whom God is calling to remain unmarried for the kingdom of heaven's sake, what then?

Well, of this at any rate you can be certain. If that be your vocation then only in that state of life will you find the fulfilment and the joy for which God created you, and to refuse it will be to court frustration and misery for you and for yours. Joy there will be, yes, often in defiance of your expectations, and always far exceeding them. But of course there will be tribulation and temptation as well; for no member of Christ crucified, no active associate in his work of redemption, can ever escape his share of the Cross. This vocation, like all other Christian vocations, is sacrificial, neither more so or less so than they. Yet the particular sacrifice involved in this vocation is different from that involved in others, and bears most heavily upon those who are still young. Vocation to Christian marriage is also and equally sacrificial; but is it fanciful to suggest that the greatest weight of this sacrifice falls upon married folk later in life, in the middle years of their marriage, when they are called to bear many anxieties and perplexities, and not least those which are inseparable from the upbringing and education of their children? The sacrifice of the celibate is different, and falls more heavily upon the days of his youth. For then he is fully aware of his manhood and has a proper pride in it. He shares to the full a healthy man's dreams and desires and temptations; for celibacy, like marriage, is essentially a vocation for *men*. It is not, as Fr Talbot used often to say, "a vocation for the undersexed".

If then you are called to the unmarried state there will be temptation and sacrifice, especially now. But you know that if that is indeed your vocation then grace to embrace it with joy will not be denied. And joy there will be—a joy which is not just celestial compensation for present privation, but a here-and-now reality. For so our Lord himself has promised. "Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, There is no man hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or mother, or father, or children, or lands, for my sake, and for the gospel's sake, but he shall receive a hundredfold *now in this time*, houses, and brethren, and

sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands . . ."[1] His promise in this as in all else is sure, as those who have embraced this state of life can testify. One of our contemporaries can speak for them all. "I cannot believe," writes Fr Huddleston, "that any priest has ever been given such rich opportunities or a life so fructified and stimulated by contrast in human relationship. It is as though the words of our Lord had been fulfilled quite literally, as though by taking the monastic vow of chastity and so 'forsaking father and mother and children and lands', one had been given all back a hundredfold. And so I do believe."[2]

And so it is. Those who are called to celibacy find no negative and frustrated second-best, but a life of fulfilment and joy in the service of God and men. To those whom he calls to renounce marriage for the sake of his kingdom God grants in the richness and diversity of relations with countless men, women, and children such a joy as is in very truth a foretaste of the joy of heaven itself.

E. G. Knapp-Fisher.

The Easter Sequence: A New Translation

[The free translation of the proper sequence hymn for Easter, *Victimae Paschali*, which is provided below, has been made to be sung to the tune *Picardy*. The plainsong setting is of course ideal, but it is beyond the skill of many parish choirs, to say nothing of the small church which maintains no regular choir, and is therefore not always heard between the Epistle and Gospel on Easter Day and during its octave. The partially rhymed prose translation given in the *English Hymnal* does not lend itself to oral recitation, and it is hoped that the unrhymed verse translation offered here will be of greater service during the octave when by tradition the hymn is to be read at low masses as well as sung on the feast itself.

The dignified tune of *Picardy* has been selected as more in the spirit of the controlled joy of the original tune than some of the more exuberant nineteenth-century melodies familiar to Anglican congregations. *Picardy* is the tune to which the popular hymn "Let all mortal flesh keep silence" is usually sung, and is well known to most congregations, besides being in itself a very easy tune to sing.]

Christians, to the Paschal Victim
Offer thankful praises now.
Lo! a Lamb the sheep redeemeth.
Christ alone of sinless life
Reconcileth sinners to the Father's love,
Reconcileth mankind to God.

---

[1] Mark 10. 29, 30.

[2] *Naught for your Comfort*, p. 212.

Death and life at last have contended
In the combat which he waged;
And as Prince of Life sent from heaven
Through his death he reigns evermore.
Tell us, Mary what thou sawest as thou went,
What thou sawest early that morn.

"There the tomb of Christ who is living,
There the napkin and the shroud,
There the glory of Resurrection,
And the angels crying aloud,
'Christ your hope now lives, to Galilee is gone,
Follow after Christ the King.' "

Christ indeed from death is risen,
And has bought us freedom and peace,
Bringing us new life and new gladness,
He our Paschal Lamb and King.
Hail, thou risen Son of Mary, Lord of Life,
Hail, thou Son of God, victor King!

A. P. Leary.

The *Joseph Saga* of Thomas Mann

A few years ago there was a craze among popular novelists for writing on biblical or sacred themes. The enormous success of books like *The Robe,* which contain a great deal of sensation, sentiment and edification but no art is a disturbing affair. The instinct which makes many people—who are not necessarily wicked intellectuals—distrust any attempt to "popularize" the Gospels through mass entertainment media which vulgarizes its material is a healthy one. The Bible is quite capable of justifying itself without the aid of romances which may satisfy curiosity but are mere substitutes for the original.

The late Thomas Mann was not a popular novelist but a great European artist grounded in the Hanseatic protestant culture.[1] His *Joseph Saga*—the related novels *The Tales of Jacob, Young Joseph, Joseph in Egypt* and *Joseph the Provider*—has recently been published *in toto,* translated by Helen Lowe-Porter. In form, tone, structure and intelligent content it is the antithesis of the romances we have deplored. Of typically Mannian weight and thoroughness—it runs to over a thousand pages—the actual impression on the reader is of an astonishing unity and economy, for it represents the fruition not only of Mann's experience but of his technical devices. Composed by an organization like the ground plan in architecture, it

[1] An excellent introduction is the symposium *The Stature of Thomas Mann* with contributions by André Gide, Bruno Walter and Erika Mann.

vibrates with related symbols, networks of recurrent imagery and the famous Mann *leitmotif* or variation on a theme repeated to give the (musical) sense of richness in unity. It composes perfectly from any angle whether the approach is Christian or humanist, theological, anthropological or aesthetic, because it is a great work of art with the power to challenge those frontiers.

As an aesthetic humanist Mann was not bound to treat the Genesis story in terms of a rigidly theological, still less fundamentalist, commentary. He is essentially a *narrator* who appears conservative in comparison with Proust or Mrs Woolf who plotted the fluctuations of personal feeling in time. The point of the *Joseph Saga* is that Mann is dealing in cyclic time where endlessly repeated forms of feeling embody in actual events. The events and mode of behaviour of the characters involved are not detached in currents of feeling but subsist in a logical cycle of cause and effect. The narrating has a dual aspect, to animate the value of the individual, and to frame him in the setting of the cyclic principle, the eternal, divinely recurrent logic, the "myth". Thus Jacob in his "elevation" by dreams and the wrestling at Jabbok, his meeting with Rachel with her "charming readiness for life", his gift from God of Joseph—Dumuzi-Absu, "true son of the abyss"—his loss of Joseph, grief, suffering, and eventual fulfilment; and Joseph himself, "beautiful and well favoured", the bearer of the spiritual blessing in his early charm, precocity, and pride, his fall, slavery, rise to power, second fall for another reason and ultimate "elevation"; both recognize in their adventures, albeit slowly and with much protest and deliberation—Jacob is given to a stately "musing", Joseph to a more *avancé* cult of brisk self-analysis—the enacting of a pattern, constant in its godly aim but variable as applied to individuals with their different "elections". The minor characters are exhausted in the service of the myth yet the protagonists are not puppets. Mann balances between freewill and necessity—a particularly charming touch is the way Joseph congratulates himself for his successes at the time (he also damns himself for his failures) only to recognize the guiding hand of the myth later. If Joseph, Jacob and the principals serve the Hebraic *ethos* of Genesis they also owe to Mann's studies of Freud: when God ordains that Isaac bless Jacob not Esau, and Mann tells us with his celebrated irony that Isaac was already blind as a result of a wish fulfilment, secretly preferring Jacob in his heart, we realize we are facing a fusion of psychology, religion and myth which elaborated through the work can quicken our awareness of the relations between all three.

The encounter of naturalistic and religious symbolism in the *Joseph Saga* forms the structure of the myth. According to Mann, God and Israel need each other. With characteristic amplitude of detail he distils the sense of the patriarchs "labouring" on the image of the godhead; or teasingly says frankly that God was destined through Israel for "a great theological career". All this of course is familiar in German mysticism, Rilke and the Existentialists; but sculpting in hard outline and solid, clear-cut structures Mann avoids

the *mystique* of ambiguity on which Existence thought depends. God's original bond with man was through jealousy, for as he detached himself from the old (female) nature divinities, his (masculine) "spirit" began to suspect any human "passion" as a breach of loyalty to himself. Before Joseph, God had sanctified the bond by the saving of Isaac: the sacrifice of the firstborn was barbaric. By this prohibition (which obsessed Kierkegaard in *Fear and Trembling*) God recognized the dignity of man—which Mann calls "the sonhood of the spirit" at the time when Joseph, the saved sacrifice, refuses to honour the Egyptian Sphinx—and God and man evaluated each other in time. He is paramount yet man is free. Joseph loses the spiritual blessing by becoming saviour of Egypt. (Joseph the Provider is modelled on Mann's admiration for the New Deal of F. D. Roosevelt.) Jacob is forced to admit this and submit to God, yet he is granted the freedom of his affections. In the great recognition scene between Joseph and Jacob this is expressed in magnificent prose—"You are blessed from the heavens above *and from the depths beneath*, with blitheness and destiny, wit and dreams. Still, it is a worldly blessing, not a spiritual one. There is submission of purpose and deed, but the heart knows not submission."

The fact that Joseph loses the spiritual blessing only to become the bearer of the equally valuable secular one proves there is no easy complacency. His ambiguous world alternates between "higher" and "lower" impulses; his God includes the daemonic in his essence. He is a "glad-sorry" man; the moral wavelength of the story is tuned in a dual dimension, the human and divine, for the distinction between God and man is not yet felt as acute. The ego is not yet defined and human feeling overflows easily into the shape of the myth. Thus men are peculiarly sensitive to signs, symbols, "charismatic" people who suggest an aura of godliness. Within this flexible scheme Mann mounts his paradoxical *motifs*. He has always felt an affinity between love, music (most absolute of arts) and death, because a fulfilment is also an end. He regards this complex, the world of forms, as *prima materia*, the feminine "nature" principle wooed by the male principle of "spirit". Young Joseph is his boldest attempt at a synthesis—born of the austere man of feeling Jacob and the lovely, innocent but frivolous Rachel. The jealousy of the brothers for Joseph is precisely the result of his "charismatic" aura which is felt by characters throughout the book. Saved from sacrifice by the Isaac promise, Joseph must fulfil the divine plan by miming a "copy" of the dying-and-rising pattern of the fertility gods; his destiny is identical with that of the spirit, always aware of the future (in the emotional, not the business man's, sense of course!), kindling expectation, creating, shunning death, regulating the vital tensions by sympathy and wit. Eventually he becomes saviour of Egypt and secular redeemer of Israel which would have starved without him, although the actual blessing is reserved to Judah, ancestor of Christ. Jacob's prophecy of Christ in the final blessing scene is very moving, not least for his praise of Judah's wife Tamar, whose ambitious will to "force herself into the story" is a type of the feminine principle in benevolent

aspect. For it is only through the union of both principles[1] that "spirit" can be born: if Joseph survives the seductress Mut (Potiphar's wife) in malevolent aspect ("Astarte am I") he marries later of his own volition, and he is himself an amalgam of Rachel's qualities as much as Jacob's. Joseph's benefactor, figured by Mann in a happy stroke as the historical Amenhotep IV, an amazingly advanced king bent on unifying the multiplicity of Egyptian gods, recognizes his qualities at sight. "He's on the right way but not the right man for the way", comments Joseph.

Mann's effort to fill religious myth with a humane content without destroying its pragmatic value links him with master contemporaries like Gide and E. M. Forster, who are fascinated by religious values but incapable of belief. This spirituality-without-faith "moralizes" modern humanist literature, so often created (certainly in the above cases) by agnostic sons of protestant families.[2] Psychologically it reflects the need for an absolute justification, a metaphysical sanction for art. But for the modern artist *all* beliefs *and* their substitutes are called in doubt. He can learn from the *Joseph Saga*. Here is a pre-idealistic, solidly "based" society rooted in instinct, reason and nature. Reformers like D. H. Lawrence would see here an alternative to the degradation of *bourgeois* technocracy with its "ideals" and "progress". Joseph and his brothers would have laughed it to scorn; so would a modern Asiatic.[3] Freud and Mann would applaud: they *see* how infantile technocracy is.

In the *Joseph Saga* themes which have engaged Mann for a lifetime are reduced from complexity to unity. Many of the incidents have a contemporary analogy, while Mann's deep insight into the real behind the scenes factors which govern behaviour is timeless. The book has lines of contact with his other major works—*Buddenbrooks* (1900), a chronicle; the mighty, symphonic *The Magic Mountain* (1924), a dialectic of ideas where *bourgeois* society is figured in a sanatorium; and *Dr Faustus* (1947), a criticism of the daemonic as Fascism and a German intellectual vice. It is remarkable that the most "religious" of his works should partake of the elements of the rest and to some extent compose them; it was a noble gesture to base a work on Jewish history at the time of his country's decimation of that race.[4]

As for the practical difficulties of the work the chief is simply its enormous length. It is like appreciating a cathedral—you have to wander about a bit to get your bearings in a new time and space scale. Nobody who has enjoyed the myth, relished the plot has wished the book an inch shorter. Its digressions are functional, not super-

[1] See Berdyaev's *The Meaning of the Creative Act*, and Ivanov's study of Dostoevsky, *Freedom and the Tragic Life*.

[2] See Noel Annan's *Leslie Stephen*, chapters 3 and 4, and *My Early Beliefs*, by Lord Keynes. Clive Bell has remarked the vein of puritanism, a Cambridge trait but also inherited, which sobered the "emancipation" of the Bloomsbury group.

[3] See Romain Rolland's *Mahatma Gandhi*, and the account of Ramakrishna in Colin Wilson's *The Outsider*.

[4] The Saga was in progress during Mann's exile, 1933–45.

fluous. (Mann was an enthusiast for Egyptology in his youth and visited the holy places of the Middle East in 1930.) They are vital as background, shading, foundation; the evocations of landscape, climate, manners, architecture, rituals, dress, etc., remind us that a myth is something lived, that God and man go into action in time and *enact* in the circumstances of being. Even the thirty-four-page Prelude with its resumé of various creation myths is necessary so that we can observe the idea of God evolve. Finally, there is the aversion for biblical novels mentioned at the start of this article. I was not prejudiced in Mann's favour when I took up his work, yet I must report that when I put it down I had a refreshed sense of the relevance of Jewish myth, a new conviction of its significance.

FREDERICK GRUBB.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Selwyn is Dean of Winchester.

Dr Hanson is Lecturer in Theology in the University of Nottingham.

The Rev. E. G. Knapp-Fisher is Principal of Cuddesdon College.

The Rev. A. P. Leary is a Librarian of Pusey House, Oxford.

Mr Grubb is on the staff of the Student Christian Movement.

CORRESPONDENCE

EUCHARISTIC CONSECRATION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Those who take an interest in this subject will be puzzled by Mr Symonds' letter in your February issue. The question which he raises whether the Last Supper itself was a celebration of the Eucharist as well as the institution of that sacrament is no doubt an interesting one for those with a speculative turn of mind; but it does not really affect Canon Sansbury's point or its "general acceptance".

There is in fact no need to go beyond Mr Symonds' own belief concerning the nature of the "blessing" or "thanksgiving" used at the Last Supper in order to support Canon Sansbury's view. It is common ground that our Lord was performing a rite familiar to his disciples but giving it a new meaning, and commanding that the rite in this new meaning should be perpetuated in the Christian Church. This being so, the task of those who first celebrated the Eucharist was to combine a faithful "doing of this" with a making plain that it was not the familiar Jewish rite but was "in remembrance of me". The former could scarcely be accomplished without the use of a thanksgiving type of prayer; and what evidence there is does suggest that the prayer was in fact of this kind in the earliest times. The latter could be achieved in various ways but was almost certain to involve

the inclusion of some suitable words in the Thanksgiving. One possible way, plainly, would be to include the narrative of the Institution; another would be by the use of what is to-day called an *anamnesis*. It is at this point and not in the choice whether or not the essential form of the prayer is to be thanksgiving, that the Spirit "was to instigate a variety of methods". If there is no thanksgiving at all, then it is difficult to see that the Eucharist is any more valid than it would be if other elements were used than bread and wine. All that Canon Sansbury is asking (and I wholeheartedly agree with him) is that other elements which may be introduced into the Thanksgiving should not be such as to suggest that the essential formula of consecration is anything other than the Thanksgiving itself.

It would, of course, be absurd to go back to a merely Jewish prayer, for that would be to ignore the "in remembrance of me" part of the command. But it is equally wrong to substitute the recitation of a particular formula or petition for part of what is included in "do this". Mr Symonds seems to accuse Canon Sansbury of the former error (unjustly, as I think); but he is quite ready to accept the latter because it has some Roman and Reformed support. Would Cranmer really have wished to see himself bracketed with the Pope as above the authority of Scripture?

Yours faithfully,
BERNARD WIGAN.

EAST MALLING.

PAPER CHURCH

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It is greatly to be hoped that the article by the Principal of Wells will be seriously studied by those who are in a position to alter or amend the present regulations which must be observed by an ordinand before he can reach Ordination.

Possibly some modification of Prebendary Haworth's four points may be wise: for example, there seem to me to be some advantages in asking a candidate to fill in a short entrance form for his theological college and for his diocese—though I certainly agree that there is no justification for asking the same referees to write more than one letter about a candidate. Secondly, the G.O.E. is a test of knowledge and is regarded as such. It seems therefore reasonable that a bishop should want to be assured of a candidate's orthodoxy and opinions by means of an essay or, better, an interview (at which the Examining Chaplains might be present). Thirdly there seems nothing to be said for the retention of Letters Testimonial either from the candidate's college, which has already had the opportunity of reporting on him, or from three incumbents who are often asked, and agree, to vouch for the behaviour, over a period of years, of a candidate whom they may have met only once or twice. This procedure is

regarded by candidates and incumbents alike as a necessary farce which must be gone through in the interests of tradition. The Si Quis, on the other hand might serve a useful purpose if it gave members of the laity who had known the candidate in a congregation, or at his place of work, a chance to express their disapproval of his ordination. But under the present arrangements Letters Testimonial and the Si Quis are entirely anachronistic. And there can surely be no objection whatever to Prebendary Haworth's plea that the contract of title should be revised, shortened and made more intelligible.

Finally, sir, I hope I shall not be presumptuous if I beg you to use your influence to ensure that the article as a whole is not allowed to become "an interesting point of view" or "a valuable suggestion"—and then pigeon-holed. It raises points which have troubled and exasperated many people for many years. It is high time that action should be taken.

Yours sincerely,
KENNETH M. CAREY.

WESTCOTT HOUSE,
CAMBRIDGE.

FAITH HEALING

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It would be difficult to answer briefly Mr Needham's criticisms of my article on "Faith Healing", but I would like to reply to a few specific points on which there appears to be have been misunderstanding or confusion.

First, from his suggestion that I have misdirected criticism of faith healing at "the Church's Ministry of Healing" it is clear that he has missed the main purpose of the article. Had the two been distinct there would have been no need for the article. With the type of ministry to the sick which Mr Needham so carefully outlines at the end of his letter there can be no quarrel, but there is reason to suppose that some clergy are setting out to imitate, or to attempt to imitate, our Lord's miracles, and there has even been a proposal that the Church is at fault in not looking for raisings from the dead as part of its ministry.

I am at a loss to know exactly what is meant by the statement that "Christ showed us plainly that disease has no place in the kingdom of God". Whatever our conception of the kingdom of God, it is obscurantist to pretend that disease, and the suffering that it causes, are other than inevitable unless the present world order be radically, even unrecognizably, changed, for one of the most striking trends of medical discovery in the last thirty years is the revelation that more and more disease is more or less directly attributable to our disordered ways of life, corporate and individual, in a world of cause and effect. Mr Needham admits that some suffering is "an inevitable

condition of the life, in an unredeemed world, of the redeemed children of the kingdom". Certainly this is true of the suffering caused by disease. As for the distinction between suffering and disease, they are of course not the same thing, nor is disease the only cause of suffering; nevertheless, in the practice of medicine the two are seen in a relationship to each other so close as to defy any easy and theoretical separation.

Later, Mr Needham reads into the article the implication that God is not concerned with the state of our bodies as well as the state of our souls, that "if God's will with regard to disease is simply to give us, through the Cross, the power to bear and transcend it, then the doctor is simply wasting his time, for he can have little hope of improving on the will of God". Of course, if I held such opinions I would not be a doctor. So far as "improving on the will of God" is concerned, it might be well to consider just what is meant by the term healing, and what is included in it. It is easy to forget that all healing is divine, whether it occurs "spontaneously", or whether it occurs with the aid of medical means, or whether it is the truly miraculous healing of disease as seen most clearly in our Lord's miracles of healing and those of the Apostles. The first of these three has always been with men as a gift of God. The second is a phenomenon almost exclusively of the last hundred years, and is no less his gift. The third appears to have been extremely rare after apostolic times, and many claims that have been made are seen to be poorly substantiated when carefully and dispassionately examined. It is difficult to believe that this is due to lack of faith, for there have been many Christians of great faith and many of the most saintly have been the most afflicted. What is to be the Christian approach to the large number of people with, for example, amputations? To say that the ministry of the Church to them is a spiritual one neither says nor implies that they are viewed with the dichotomy that Mr Needham alleges. If he will read the last three paragraphs of the article carefully he will see that there is a plea for the integration of the work of clergy and doctors, but for an integration which means fusion rather than confusion. Anyone who has tried to grapple with the difficulties raised by a person with both spiritual and psychological problems will know full well how inextricably mixed they are, and how indivisible is the individual.

However, it may be necessary for two different people to be called in to help them. Until all the clergy are medically qualified, or all doctors are committed and well-informed Christians—and I will leave Mr Needham to decide which of these two is the more likely to occur first—it will be inevitable. Until then it is only realistic for each to respect and try to understand the other, for the sake of those whom they serve. This does not involve, as is alleged, an "apparent attempt to split the man into two by asking two individuals to heal the separate halves". To recognize this is only realistic, as it is also to recognize that the layman's conception of disease is of something predominantly material and physical within his body. For this reason, he is liable to misconstrue the Church's ministry to the sick

as the "magical piece of quack doctoring" which Mr Needham so rightly deplores. The danger of this happening will increase in proportion to the degree to which the conduct of the ministry to the sick resembles the faith healing whose characters I attempted to describe. That it sometimes does resemble it to-day is undeniable and unfortunate. That it should not is the concern of many Christian members of the medical profession, and, from his last paragraph, I feel sure that it is the concern of Mr Needham too.

Yours faithfully,
A. P. Waterson.

Emmanuel College,
Cambridge.

NEWSPAPER OR MAGAZINE

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Mr Talbot is right to stress, in his letter in Theology, the great possibility of the more traditional parish magazine.

It might ease the situation for many of the clergy if they were to combine with their neighbours in producing their magazine. In some country dioceses this is being done most successfully on a deanery basis; in towns this can be done with a smaller grouping of parishes.

Here in Smethwick three parishes launched in January a joint magazine; this has many advantages. In the first place it makes it possible for one of the parishes with a large population, but with hardly any shops, to have a printed magazine; this parish sells 1,000 copies a month, while the other two parishes with smaller populations produce from their shops a revenue of about £200 a year in advertisement, as our combined circulation is an attractive proposition to advertisers. It also means we can produce a much more interesting magazine than could be put out by any of the three parishes on their own, and our combined population of 25,000 becomes aware of a common Christian policy; a certain friendly rivalry in reading about neighbouring parishes and comparing the statistics for communicants and collections that are set out in parallel columns is proving valuable.

Each parish has certain pages for its own material; other pages are devoted to articles that concern all three. Whereas our previous productions had a combined circulation of 1,400 we have already passed the 2,000 mark; it is also worth pointing out that the total time spent by the three clergy on producing the joint magazine is certainly far less than the time spent before on their previously separate duplicated and much slighter printed efforts.

Yours faithfully,
John Grimwade.

St Mark's Parsonage,
Smethwick.

THEOLOGICAL STUDIES IN AUSTRALIA

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Your Australian correspondent "Mibsam" is not quite accurate in his remarks (December 1956) about theological studies in Australian universities, at least as far as Queensland is concerned. Though there is as yet no faculty of divinity here, there is in existence a Board of Studies in Divinity operating within the Faculty of Arts, so that for some years now it has been possible to study for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, either pass or honours, and to proceed to a doctorate as well. The B.D. is a post-graduate degree of a reasonably high standard. In addition, non-graduates may study for a Diploma in Divinity, which involves at least two years' full-time study at tertiary level. These courses are becoming increasingly popular and there were about eighty students enrolled last year for the various divinity subjcts.

The "individual theological subjects taught for the B.A. in Brisbane" consist of the Old Testament and New Testament (known officially as Biblical Literature A and B respectively), and these have been available in the Arts course as a major subject since 1938.

Further, I deprecate his remarks about the theological colleges and the Australian College of Theology. The latter is purely an examining body but seeks to keep up a high standard of academic learning, and the larger theological colleges at least have striven to provide adequate instruction for their students. The real difficulty here in Australia lies in the fact that with the present almost desperate shortage of clergy men are accepted into our colleges before they are intellectually capable of coping with the instruction given, and worse still are sometimes ordained before they have really attained even a moderate degree of learning. No one here could be satisfied with the present standards generally, but I feel that your correspondent has somewhat overstated his case.

Yours, etc.,
A. L. SHARWOOD.

ST JOHN'S COLLEGE,
BRISBANE.
10 *February* 1957.

A reply from Mr Philip Mairet to Mr Munby's article in the March number will appear next month.—Ed. THEOLOGY.

BOOK REVIEWS

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY IN ITS CONTEMPORARY SETTING. By R. Bultmann. Translated by R. H. Fuller. Thames and Hudson. 18s.

Until recently Dr Bultmann's mature views on the development and nature of early Christian thought have not been available in

English. The present volume provides an account, more popular than the *Theology of the New Testament*, of his understanding of primitive Christianity against its background. He deals with the Old Testament heritage, Judaism, the Greek heritage, and Hellenism. This last has special importance, and the section outlines the teachings of Stoicism, star worship, the mystery religions, and gnosticism. The book contains adequate indexes, and 23 pages of notes and bibliography to which Professor Fuller has added some further English works. By a quaint whim of the publisher, the biblical quotations are given in the A.V.

Although this is clearly intended to be a non-technical work, it will be found hard going by anyone who is not already well acquainted with the various subjects treated. It will be read with most profit by a student willing to entertain new lines of thought in a familiar field. It is closely packed, has memorable and sometimes provoking judgments, and often proceeds from lucid exposition to semi-philosophical generalizations that are far from clear. So, for example, he says that "sin is disobedience against the demand of the here and now"—though it is possible that this thought could have been put into more comprehensible English form. From time to time the reader will discover the results of an actively demythologizing mind. In speaking of the eschatological preaching of Jesus Dr Bultmann says: "He is so convinced of God's will and determination, and that it is his business to proclaim it, that he feels himself to be standing on the frontiers of time. His eschatological preaching is not the outcome of wishful thinking or speculation, but of his sense of the utter nothingness of man before God. The understanding of human life implied thereby clearly does not stand or fall with his expectation of an imminent end of the world. It contains a definite judgment upon the world. In other words, it sees the world exclusively *sub specie Dei*." About such a re-interpretation it is proper to ask whether it contains a true insight into the teaching of Jesus ("the utter nothingness of man before God" scarcely seems to fit exactly), whether it exhausts the meaning of his eschatology, and whether the transposition from one category to another (i.e. *from* the culmination of the divine activity *to* the static divine-human relationship) is permissible.

As one would expect, the proclamation of Jesus is described under Judaism, though as a comprehensive protest against it. Jesus did not invite faith in himself, even though he was himself "the sign of the time". Nor did he establish a religious order or sect (still less a church), but called the individual, divorced from history, to decision. Yet man's real life consists in his encounter with his neighbour and his response to the claims of God. It is clear that this is not the old-fashioned individualism of Liberal theology, nor does it imply a residual Christology. God does not speak to men through history, he says, but through Christ, and through the word which proclaims him. So it is also clear that "history" is a word that means different things for Dr Bultmann than it does for us. This is a constant source of confusion in discussions between theologians brought up in British or

German traditions; and the task of translation is not solved by putting a German book into English, even when it is done with Professor Fuller's care and tact. In the world of discourse familiar in Germany to-day, Dr Bultmann's phrases take on a more precise and forceful meaning than they do for us, particularly his reiterated description of Christian, and indeed of human, existence as "openness for the future". (He makes a typically brilliant distinction between the Stoic who, because of his reason, is free *from* the future and the Christian who, on account of grace, is free *for* the future, i.e. for encounters in which he will experience God's grace ever anew as a gift from outside.) So, too, in its German situation, it is comprehensible that his description of primitive Christianity is set out not as a doctrine of God (contrast the Old Testament heritage) but as a doctrine of man—man in relation to time, to the world, and to redemption. It proceeds from the same motive as his whole concern to remove "myth" from the presentation of Christianity, viz. his perception that men are no longer concerned with transcendent reality but with self-understanding—as perhaps they always have been.

In assessing primitive Christianity (which he regards as the result of syncretism), the distinctive feature of Dr Bultmann's method is that gnosticism, somewhat generously defined, provides the standard. He asks whether Christianity contains a single, new, and unique doctrine of human existence. At each stage, therefore, he attempts to show the closeness of the Christian to the gnostic view, and yet within the agreement the essential difference. For example, gnosticism and Christianity both regard man as in bondage to hostile cosmic powers, but with this difference—according to gnosticism it is due to fate, according to Christianity it is due to guilt as well. At times it appears that Christianity is but gnosticism with a difference, and yet the difference is radical. The chief question raised by this book is whether gnosticism provides the right canon for assessing Christianity, and even whether the *religionsgeschichtlich* method is an adequate one to comprehend this phenomenon.

KENNETH GRAYSTON.

DIDSBURY COLLEGE,
BRISTOL.

FAITH, REASON, AND EXISTENCE. AN INTRODUCTION TO CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. By John A. Hutchison. Oxford University Press. 27s. 6d.

CHRISTIANITY AND COMMUNICATION. By F. W. Dillistone. Collins. 12s. 6d.

A note on the dustcover tells us that Dr Reinhold Niebuhr thinks Dr Hutchison's book "the most searching, balanced, and authoritative modern interpretation of the relationship of faith to reason, which we have had for a long time": and the President of Union Theological Seminary agrees, and says it "is exactly the book for

which we have been waiting". Such claims seem to me to be exaggerated. Dr Hutchison himself says in his foreword that the book has grown out of courses, and that the material contained in the book "can be used for a term's work, or with readings in primary sources for a year's work". I think it should be appraised by the standards of the author himself, and not in the language of the dustcover.

The book is "an essay in definition" (p. 23), and attempts a "philosophic analysis of contemporary problems of religious thought" (p. 7). This choice of method explains some of the limitations of the book. Religion is described as the answer given to the questions: "What is my life all about? What is the meaning of my existence? Why am I here?" (p. 25). Later on it is spoken as as the "poetry by which men live" (p. 57); and later still there is a brief discussion which enlarges the description of religion in terms of what are called "a few of the more important religious organs" (p. 212). Dr Hutchison reminds his readers that he will "practice the existential method", and that "religious propositions will be validated or disproven by reference to the facts of human existence as they may be perceived in the active encounter of self and world" (p. 32).

His book falls into two unequal parts—Chapters I–V, and VI–IX. The first two chapters are introductory. He discusses his method and his task, and then relates to this some problems of symbols and language. The heart of the book lies in Chapters III to V. In Chapter III Dr Hutchison takes the fundamental questions provoked by the fact of man's existence (see above: quotation from p. 25), and in the next two chapters he seeks to show that God is the answer to these questions. He argues that there is no foundation for a philosophy of religion apart from an actual approach to God as a "religiously significant object" (p. 119). Consequently, "arguments" for the existence of God are really "all analogies, which undertake to grasp and state an altogether unique relation" (p. 151), (I am not sure that he here deals fairly with Tennant's exposition of the teleological argument); and there is a case to be made for the religious significance of atheism (pp. 158 ff.).

At this point the scale and the coherence of the book seem to change. Chapter VI treats successively of History, History and Theology, Progress, Marxism, and Biblical Categories; and Chapter VII deals in a similar way with Culture in various aspects. In Chapter VIII Science and Religion are "reconsidered" in about thirty pages; and in the last chapter a very brief survey of the nature of ethics is followed by a section on the relation of religion to ethics, and what are frankly called "notes on moral philosophy" (p. 283) and "a sketch, necessarily brief" (p. 289), of the "different traditional ways for relating Christian ethics to social policy".

As an introduction to some contemporary problems the first half of the book is to be commended. I think it would stimulate thought. The second half might encourage people to be scrappy. There are some unsatisfactory gaps. The problem of knowledge is not faced, and on p. 46 there is a virtual disparagement of epistemology. More help might have been expected in thinking out the category of cause.

And more might have been given about the mediation of meaning than we find at the beginning of Chapter V.

The index is very feeble. The suggestions for further reading are interesting and helpful.

I cannot escape having to say that I found the Dean of Liverpool's book disappointing. From lectures as well as from *Christianity and Symbolism* one had had expectations aroused. But they were not satisfied, and that is a pity; for there is nothing more difficult than communication, and nothing more important for a Christian who is concerned to spread the good news. I think the Dean has packed too much into too small a space. After two introductory chapters opening up his subject and establishing "the Image and the Word as the basic elements in all communication" (p. 26), there is a survey in Chapters III to VI of what the Christian has to communicate leading up to the "conclusion . . . that the essential Christian message consists of a story and a picture" (p. 98). A short seventh chapter on the character of the communicator leads on to the eighth, where the point is made that all techniques must be used for communication (I should have liked some comments on the contemporary use of the dialled sermon); and then to the ninth, and last, where there is a discussion of the task of the translator and the obstacles which confront him. The Dean's closing emphasis on imaginative identification and reciprocal interchange took me back forty years to barracks in India, and the attempt to mediate in Urdu to a group of sepoys the Barr and Stroud range-finder, and the concept of infinity involved in its use. I can still remember how fatally easy it was "to miss the proper wavelength" (p. 141), and the opportunities I had to discover when "the limit to effective response" (p. 147) was reached. At that time I had never attempted to communicate the Christian message; but now I know how hard a task it is I welcome the help the Dean offers us even though I had hoped for more than he gives.

H. C. L. Heywood.

Southwell.

The Abyss of Truth. By Nathaniel Micklem. Geoffrey Bles. 8s. 6d.

This is a delightful book. It gives one the impression of being asked to a long afternoon walk through (dare I say it?) Christ Church Meadow, and invited to a discussion of some of the fundamental ideas of religion in the company of one who, though charitable and wise, is never didactic. It starts from the Physic Garden, and asks the age-old questions about the kind of knowledge we can have about anything and sets out on a gentle perambulation through Christian history armed with the clue that the search for truth is part of the love of God, that *scientia* in the end becomes *sapientia*.

In the section on revelation and dogma, after looking at the great names of scholastic philosophy, he recognizes, more frankly than some, that even in what might appear to be the most arid wastes of intellectualism, all the great scholastics were concerned not so much

with the formulation of doctrine as with apprehension of the living God; that faith is blind and dark unless it be loved and lived. Dr Micklem goes on to affirm the usual position, so much canvassed to-day, that "the Gospel is not a series of propositions about God" but the record of "the mighty acts of God". The real difficulty, it seems, is to find any Christian thinker who has really thought otherwise! For God wills *all* men to be saved. Yet if revelation is only to be given in the apprehended significance of events, how can it be shared or communicated? Is not every man thus a sort of monad of revelatory receptivity, if truth cannot, must not, dare not, get itself expressed in formulas of sanctified significance? Dr Micklem is not at all happy with the kind of view which is represented by Brunner, who claims that the Church has "turned the revelation of the Son into the revelation of an eternal truth about the Son". Or with the even more fierce phrase of Forsyth, "the soul of Orthodoxy and Popery is the idea of salvation by truths. Catholicism means, at heart, the idolatry not so much of the wafer, as of a foregone system of truth." Or, more astonishing, from A. L. Lilley, of all people, "Jeremiah is as clearly revelation as the Athanasian Creed is not". But it is gratifying to find yet another writer paying due honour to that incomparable theologian and philosopher, Dean Mansel, who was so shamelessly misrepresented by F. D. Maurice.

The end of Dr Micklem's journey is at a position which would have commended itself to the ancient fathers. "All knowledge is by illumination, and all illumination is a participation of the Word of God." *Illuminatio nostra participatio Verbi.*

It seems clear that in stamping on the grave of "propositional theology" so-called, we have begun to slip into some contradictory formulas which need closer analysis than they have yet received.

G. L. Phillips.

University of London.

John Calvin. By Basil Hall. George Philip and Son. 1s. 6d.

The Theology of Calvin. By Wilhelm Niesel. Translated by Harold Knight. Lutterworth Press. 27s. 6d.

The first of these may be regarded as an aperitif for the second. In it Mr Hall devotes thirty-five pages of closely packed material to two aspects of Calvin, namely, his work as a humanist and as a theologian. The pamphlet is well written and contains a useful bibliography on Calvin. Mr Hall has deliberately omitted political and economic practices claiming to derive their origin from Calvin. He also reminds us that what passes for Calvinism and what Calvin wrote are often different things. Within a small compass a good piece of work is the result.

Dr Niesel is a well-known figure in the Reformed Churches in Germany and has collaborated to produce a five-volume edition of select works of Calvin's writings. His work is a full-scale treatment of Calvin's theology, accurate and painstaking, using quotations from

Calvin freely but not extensively. Dr Niesel is not satisfied with previous attempts to expand and interpret Calvin's theology. "Calvin research", he says, "suffers from the defect that the golden thread which runs through it has not yet been discovered" (p. 9). Calvin literature has hitherto been either confessional in outlook, or influenced by the rationalistic tendencies of the writers or their particular theological school. Hence, the essence of his theology must be sought so that its underlying intention may be found. Dr Niesel proceeds to do this in a clear orderly fashion concerning a wide range of topics and laying less stress on the sovereignty of God and predestination than Mr Hall.

Chapters deal with Knowledge of God, the Trinity, Creation and Providence, Sin, the Law of God, the old and New Testaments, the Mediator, the Grace of Christ within us, the Life of a Christian Man, Prayer, God's Eternal Election, the Church, the Sacraments, Secular Government, and a short final chapter on Calvin's Theology. The order follows the sequence of Calvin's Institutes. The four main divisions correspond to the three sections of the Creed, and these deal with the Church. The topic forms the longest chapter in the book under review and Dr Niesel might well use Mr Hall's phrase of the Church (p. 23), "the Architectonic Principle". It seems that more might be said about hope and about the work of the Holy Spirit, though this is referred to in connexion with a number of different topics, e.g. Prayer, the Scriptures, the Sacraments. The section on the Scriptures shows that Calvin cannot be called a literalist. The material on the Sacraments is well worth our attention and the author shows how Calvin speaks of baptism as a deeply significant event (pp. 220 ff.); so it is with the Eucharist. Christ is the centre of both and he operates through the Spirit. The self-revelation of God in Jesus Christ is for Niesel the focal point and the centre of Calvin's theology. It is for this reason that he devotes such attention to the Scriptures, the Church, the Sacraments, to law, to regeneraion, and to sanctification. It is Christ who first declares to us the truth about our human situation. Thus the doctrine of election which is so often regarded as very much to the fore in Calvin's theology really deserves only a minor place.

In recent years Calvin's theology is being more widely appreciated and perhaps as we realize the importance of Christology we shall read Calvin more. Dr Niesel's book will help us here.

H. F. Woodhouse.
Anglican Theological College of British Columbia,
Vancouver.

Pastoral Theology: A Reorientation. By Martin Thornton. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

The Parish Comes Alive. By E. W. Southcott. Mowbrays. 10s. 6d.

These two books are in great contrast. Both are concerned with

the parish priest and his work; the first is called a reorientation and the second begins with "The Revolutionary Community"; indeed, both books call for new ways in pastoral thinking and practice, but each book has its own way of approach and the conclusions are vastly different.

Fr Thornton has a very laudable objective in trying to find a comprehensive plan or shape in pastoral theology. There is a great need for some such key, so that priorities can be determined and the work of the parish priest can be seen as a whole. Fr Thornton is right in looking for a theological basis for his conception of parish work, but there will be many readers who will think that his solution is too simple. He proposes to base his whole thesis on the theme of the Remnant Church, which for him in practice demands that the pastoral ministry is concerned almost entirely with the ascetical training of the few. When carried to its logical conclusion there are surprising results for the evaluation of pastoral work.

The book is both interesting and provocative. It is a pity so much is in technical terms of a varied nature, but it makes the reader think out afresh the methods and objects of pastoral work, especially when he disagrees with the author, and such re-thinking will be most valuable. The illustrations used by Fr Thornton help to make clear his argument, and they are excellent, but must not be taken to prove his claims.

In his Preface, Fr Thornton thinks that his theme is a "subject for a group of writers—at least a biblical scholar, dogmatist, and historian—rather than for one". It might be said that an adequate review of the book demands such a group. The New Testament chapters clearly are selections of material which suit his theme, but there is so much that could be used to draw different conclusions about, say, evangelism, preaching, and visiting. He is a bold man to assert that missionary work is a deviation from the norm, either in New Testament or in later ages.

Many of his pungent criticisms of modern pastoral work strike home. His treatment of spiritual direction is definitely helpful, but his conception of the place and nature of the Daily Office will not be acceptable to many. Fr Thornton has not merely given a reorientation of pastoral work, he has rather emphasized one part of it to the exclusion, it appears, of nearly all the rest. This book is one which ought to be read, but the conclusions can be applied only with very great caution indeed.

Canon Southcott has written his book in direct and challenging terms, and it will attract a wide circle of readers, both clerical and lay, who will see in it an expression of the ideas of the "Parish and People" movement. The author decribes what the Church has done and is doing at Halton, and seeks for a theology to underlie all that is attempted. Any priest who reads it will admire the courage of the author, but will hesitate to follow him all the way.

Chief interest will focus in the house-church idea, the implications of which are not yet fully apparent. A former generation had cottage meetings, and house meetings are a well-known feature of evangelistic

practice, but Canon Southcott has ventured on new ground with his house celebrations. But the indiscriminate celebrations of the Holy Communion may not be such a force for parochial unity as he suggests.

It will be seen that much of the work Canon Southcott describes is of recent date; indeed, he is honest enough to give us the exact dates in his changing plans. His methods may be progressive, or they may be moving in circles; it is too early yet to know the abiding worth of his experiments. Of the value to souls of the work which has been done there is no doubt.

The true Anglican pastoral tradition will lie in a judicious balance between the ideals of these two books, but their differences show once more the urgent need to demonstrate the true basis of Anglican pastoralia in theology.

Wawne Vicarage,
Hull.

C. R. Forder.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Pattern of Christian Belief. By J. W. D. Smith. Nelson. 12s. 6d.

This "essay in biblical interpretation" is a useful work of popularization, designed to provide a straightforward account of the pattern which modern study has rediscovered in the Bible. The general public is said to take very seriously what scholars were saying about fifty years ago; and certainly the destructive effects of the analytic phase of study still dominate the public mind. It is good, therefore, to have an uncomplicated exposition of the chief contents of the Bible which shows how they find their unity in a single dramatic theme. Not all of the author's interpretations commend themselves equally (for instance, where he closely follows T. W. Manson's *Teaching of Jesus*); but in a work of this kind an author has to choose his point of view and abide by it, denying himself the luxury of discussion.

The Claims of Christ. By Hugh Martin. S.C.M. Press. 7s.

The idea that as a matter of objective fact the Gospels present a merely human Jesus, and that "the message of Jesus" can be easily separated from the Church's faith in his Person, is one which perennially needs patient rebuttal. Dr Martin's concise presentation of the relevant evidence in the Synoptic Gospels is welcome. He first places the subject in the context of contemporary discussion (Bultmann, etc.), and then shows how the various strands in the record—Christ's attitude to his disciples and to the authorities, his treatment of sinners, his veiled speech about himself, etc.—combine inevitably to press the question, Whom say ye that I am? Students will find this book a useful introduction to the subject, and it can be recommended to study-groups.

THE FORMATION OF THE PAULINE CORPUS OF LETTERS. By C. Leslie Mitton. Epworth Press. 8s. 6d.

Few readers of the Epistles devote any thought to the process by which St Paul's letters to particular churches and individuals became authoritative documents universally acknowledged. Most of us assume that they gradually became known and accepted through copies being passed round or carried from place to place by travelling Christians. This view has been challenged by American scholars, whose views are here conveniently expressed and discussed by Dr Mitton. He maintains that Paul's writings were neglected for a full generation after his death, and then suddenly sprang into prominence as a definite corpus (except for the Pastorals) about A.D. 90, being then published (cp. Cicero or Pliny) perhaps as a result of the interest aroused by the Book of Acts. This theory is linked with the view that Ephesians was written by a Paulinist, as an introduction to the collection. A number of other interesting conjectures cohere with the theory, which though dealing with matters of secondary importance, nevertheless throws some new light on the least known period of Church History.

J. D. M. STUART.

DELHI.

PRAYING FOR UNITY. By Olive Wyon. Edinburgh House Press. 1s. 6d.

A MODERN CATECHISM. By Paul A. Welsby. Longmans 2s. 6d.

CONVERSION. By W. R. Forrester. Saint Andrew Press. 1s. 6d.

A SHORT BIBLE. Arranged by Austin Farrer. Collins. 2s. 6d.

MASTERY. By E. Stanley Jones. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

MESSAGES FROM THE PARABLES. By Carl A. Glover. Independent Press. 8s. 6d.

Miss Wyon's collection of prayers based on the cycle of the Christian year are refreshing where they are not didactic. They draw with insight and discrimination on the Bible and the early liturgies, and should prove useful to a serious-minded parish intercession group.

Mr Welsby's Catechism is an elucidation of the Prayer Book Catechism by means of supplementary questions and answers. The result is generally sound, though his remarks on the works of the devil (p. 3) and the importance of the resurrection (p. 13) need reconsideration. The last answer on the Trinity is unnecessarily negative. We do know something about its inner unity. A book with many uses.

"If there is only 'a connoisseur in religion' in the pulpit there will never be Pentecost in the pew." Remarks of this sort certainly justify the reprint of Mr Forrester's paper on Conversion.

The most serious and tantalizing gap in Christian literature is St Luke's wellnigh unforgivable omission of our Lord's exposition of the things concerning himself on the road to Emmaus. Dr Farrer's selections from the Old Testament give a vivid impression of the gist of that exposition, and his use of Ecclesiasticus, in which our Lord's mind was so obviously saturated, is especially interesting and effec-

tive. Perhaps his lively genius will go further and one day give us a verbatim reconstruction of that famous discourse within the time limit of a four- or five-mile walk. In one classic phrase in a valuable introduction he defines the nexus between the two Testaments: "The one great complex living parable of the New Covenant is the Old."

In these days of high pressure existential thinking books with titles like "Mastery" strike one as quaint to the point of shocking. Nevertheless, Mr Jones writes with power and provides his readers with a readable meditation for every day of the year.

Similarly, without shedding much new light on the parables, Mr Glover's book will prove a useful introduction for those who have so far considered the Kingdom of God only as a vague idea and the parables in isolation.

JOHN BYROM.

CHEADLE HULME.

FATHER CONGREVE OF COWLEY. By M. V. Woodgate. S.P.C.K. 5s.

RIGHT PATHS. A Memoir of A. A. Markham. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

THE STORY OF MARY LIU. By Edward Hunter. Hodder and Stoughton. 15s.

LAUGHING SOLDIER. A Biographical Sketch. By Hilary Sheppard. Faith Press. 4s.

Miss M. V. Woodgate tells us a good deal about Father Congreve when she says that Thomas à Kempis, Julian of Norwich and Father Baker, whose *Holy Wisdom* he read daily, were his favourite spiritual writers. By quotations from his writings she enables the reader to get glimpses of his personality which illuminate the biographical details which she has collected. Father Congreve is so much the poet that his words are a gesture which point to that which lay beyond him and yet was at the same time the ground of his being. Those who ponder what he has written will discover much about themselves—the wise man is a mirror in which others may see themselves. There is space to cite one of the quotations which Miss Woodgate has chosen to include: "And then I find besides, that the sorrow of nature has its strange fascination for me *because its sorrow is my own sorrow*. The whole creation groaneth and travaileth *together*. The news which the cable brought me last week—my own daily moral and spiritual failures and disappointments—I find that the sea carries these sorrows of mine. The clouds know my secret, and hide me and my sorrows in their caverns. And this is part of the mystery of their beauty, which is but a name for love."

The poet has an advantage over the musician. Perhaps if the Kyrie Eleison which A. A. Markham composed when a schoolboy at Westminster School could be heard we might see the man more clearly in the carefully planned memoir. However, the details show him as one who worked with the ceaseless diligence and compassion only possible to a man of spiritual maturity. Those who knew him as parish priest and bishop will specially welcome this book, and others can learn

from it the meaning of devotion to duty through a period of much political, sociological and ecclesiastical change.

Mary Liu stands out as a woman of profound faith and bravery, shown in her love of life in spite of enormous physical disability and the experience of imprisonment and "brain-washing" after the Chinese Communist victory in 1949. At the age of four she was abandoned outside Nanking's walls. She was cared for in a Methodist hospital, where she was helped to begin to face life after the amputation of her hands and feet on account of frostbite. The mere statement of the facts of her life make one put the book down in wonder, and in shame over one's own exaggerated reaction to slight inconveniences and rumours of danger.

Laughing Soldier is an attempt to describe the high spirits and piety of a young soldier who died of wounds in Korea. In a measure all biographies fail in ways particularly obvious to those who write them, but it would be a poorer world if no one tried to commemorate the brave, the lovable, and the strong whose words and deeds expressed in concrete terms the reality of faith, hope, and charity.

MANCHESTER. R. E. C. BROWNE.

THE TRIUMPH OF GRACE IN THE THEOLOGY OF KARL BARTH. By G. C. Berkouwer. Paternoster. 18s.

CHRIST AND CONSCIENCE. By N. H. G. Robinson. Nisbet. 17s. 6d.

CHRIST AND ADAM—MAN AND HUMANITY IN ROMANS 5. By Karl Barth. Oliver and Boyd. 6s.

Dr Berkouwer's long study of the main principle of Karl Barth's theology deserves a welcome. It contains a lucid and illuminating exposition of Barth's teaching based on admiration and a resolve to take great pains not to misrepresent him (as Barth himself has appreciated, K.D., IV, 2, p. x); and at the same time a resolute criticism from the standpoint of "the riches and truth of the Reformed confession, and in that confession from the absolute authority of Holy Scripture" (p. 389). (For a second edition the English needs a careful revision to remove such words as "instructurated" (p. 198) or "dogmatological" (p. 280), or, as on p. 380, to make the sense of an important paragraph clear.) Dr Berkouwer, of course, welcomes the sustained emphasis on the triumph of grace in Barth's theology; his complaint is that by doing this in the wrong way Barth imperils the very thing that he is anxious to secure. He is entirely with Barth in being opposed to a synergistic theology; his complaint is that Barth's ruthlessly anti-synergistic theology gives much less freedom to man than the Scriptures themselves allow, and we do not have to share the whole of Dr Berkouwer's attitude to the Bible to think that the comment is both fair and true. His detailed criticism is that the *a priori* triumph of grace in Barth, involving as it does the ontological impossibility of sin and unbelief, does not do justice to the reality of history; and he raises in an interesting way the questions whether the logic of Barth's theology demands the universalism

which he persistently rejects, and whether Barth's conception of the eternalizing of our ending life can do justice to the faith of the New Testament. For British theologians who find themselves defeated by the wearisome verbosity of the *Dogmatik*, this book, in both aspects, meets a real need.

Professor Robinson's book—the contents of which contrast oddly with Hastings Randall's book *Conscience and Christ* (1916)—is also concerned with Karl Barth. But Barth's theology is only one of three themes. Another is the defence against Professor H. D. Lewis of the universality of sin. The thinking is honest and constructive, but at the crucial point it lapses into uninterpreted religious affirmation (p. 63) which begs the question. The study does not quite reach the delicate balance between philosophy and theology of which Clement Webb was such a master. The third theme is a study of logical empiricism and existentialism in relation to conscience. This is so good as to make the jejune references to "logical positivism" in the earlier part of the book inexplicable. With regard to Barth, Dr Robinson contends in his preface that "Barthianism, while it is an evangelical theology, is to be more precisely characterized within that field as a type of evangelical theology which is non-ethical, metaphysical and radically empirical". It is important to realize that these three adjectives refer to the same point, in principle the same as that made by Dr Berkouwer, that if salvation is completely *given*, the reality of man in his response to God is imperilled. Dr Robinson might have done better if, instead of holding that Barth's theology is evangelical but unethical, he stated the hint that he gives on p. 143 more boldly and said that a too ruthless exclusion of the human element in salvation endangered its evangelical character.

Barth's *Christ and Adam* is, of course, concerned with the main principle of his theology, the absolute priority of Christ, a position explicitly denied by Professor Robinson (p. 131). Those who accept the principle will rejoice in this vigorous and masterful theological interpretation of Romans 5. Others may, perhaps, contrast it with Professor C. H. Dodd's treatment of the chapter, and notice an almost brutal restriction of freedom—the freedom of the reader, because no questions arising from the intellectual atmosphere of the twentieth century are allowed, and the freedom of the apostle, who is not allowed to think differently from Karl Barth. Doubtless Dr Barth would think it a mishandling of the Word of God to dissent from the great apostle, but he has no compunction about cruelly compressing him to fit a Procrustean bed of his own devising.

BRADFORD. H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

THE SPIRIT AND FORMS OF PROTESTANTISM. By Louis Bouyer. Translated by A. V. Littledale. Harvill Press. 18s.

The French original of this profound and generous book, published under the title *Du Protestantisme à l'Église,* was noticed at some length and with deserved enthusiasm in an editorial in THEOLOGY in October 1954. The hope, there expressed, that it might

be translated into English has now been excellently fulfilled, and the English reader thus enabled to digest not only penetrating criticism of Luther and Calvin, and of Barth, but appreciation of them of a depth that is hardly to be matched in the writings of their disciples. Almost one is converted to the austerity of genuine Calvinist worship, so moving is the passage in which its meaning and grandeur are revealed. To criticize the thesis of one, whose interests and erudition are so amazingly wide, must be temerarious, yet it may be wondered whether Occam and the Nominalists will bear quite such an entire structure of blame as has been built upon them here. So too Père Bouyer's own contention that "no religion, or religious movement, is to be judged on the basis of its theological expositions", but that "it is something living, and has to be looked for in the communities where it has its life", seems hardly to consort with his appeals to assemblies and doctors, to whose teaching Rome may be officially committed, but whose influence is so little apparent in the Rome that one meets. Just as the "new look" Rome that is emerging, and which it would be dog-in-the-manger on our part not to welcome, remains involved in what must seem humanly ineradicable errors, so the singularly Anglican point of view that peeps out of some of the later paragraphs of this book is hardly to be met with in England outside the Church of England. Yet will one rejoice and give thanks for what is at once so eirenic and so unsentimental. More than that, it is not for its ecumenical optimism that this book will be read but for its penetration and clarity. To these an appended note on the Argument from Scripture by another hand provides an interestingly contrasting foil. Most of all perhaps, having read *The Spirit and Forms of Protestantism*, one finds oneself wishing that one might have the friendship of its author.

MAIDSTONE. FRANK BENNETT.

THE GOSPEL OF MARK. By William Barclay. St Andrew Press. 12s. 6d. (or in paper covers, 5s. 6d.).

A devotional commentary of 400 pages for laymen who read the Bible every day. It is never dull, is packed with racy illustrations, and provides enough background information to make each section intelligible and interesting. The emphasis is homiletic rather than theological: the loaves and fishes " did not seem much. But Jesus took (them) and worked wonders with them. In the hands of Jesus little is always much. We may think we have little talent . . . to give to Jesus. That is no reason for a hopeless pessimism such as the disciples had. . . . If we put ourselves into the hands of Jesus Christ there is no telling what he can do with us and through us." "There seem insuperable difficulties in taking the story of the Cursing of the Fig Tree literally. It seems to us to be in some way connected with the Parable of the Fruitless Tree. But in any event the whole lesson of the incident is that uselessness invited disaster."

CUDDESDON COLLEGE. WILFRID BROWNING.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN: Basil Mitchell (Ed.), *Faith and Logic* (21s.); A. J. Arberry, *Revelation and Reason in Islam* (12s. 6d.).

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: Ian Hislop, O.P., *A Catechism for Adults* (5s.); Jordan Aumann, O. P., and David L. Greenstock, *The Meaning of Christian Perfection* (12s. 6d.).

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY: Dorothea Stephen, *The Gita in Life* (Rs. 2-8).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: *Thomas Cranmer*, 1489–1556—Three commemorative lectures delivered in Lambeth Palace, 1956 (2s. 6d.).

CHURCH UNION: Jonathan Graham, C.R., *He Came unto His Own* (4s.).

T. AND T. CLARK: Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, Vol. IV, *The Doctrine of Reconciliation*, Part 1 (50s.).

DARWEN FINLAYSON: Paul Roubiczek, *Thinking towards Religion* (15s.).

ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES PRESS: E. O. James, *History of Religions* (7s. 6d.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Norman H. Snaith, *Amos, Hosea and Micah* (9s. 6d.).

HARPER AND BROTHERS: Julius A. Bewer, *The Book of Ezekiel, chapters* 24–48 (95 cents).

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS (O.U.P.): Perry Miller, *Errand into the Wilderness* (38s.).

HEFFER AND SONS: John Ferguson, *Pelagius* (15s.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Thomas R. Kelly, *A Testament of Devotion* (7s. 6d.); Eric James, *The Double Cure* (2s. 6d.); H. G. G. Herklots, *Operation Firm Faith* (4s. 6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: R. V. G. Tasker, *The Narrow Way* [cheap edition], (2s. 6d.).

LINCOLNS-PRAGER: Franz Kobler, *The Vision was there: a history of the British movement for the restoration of the Jews to Palestine* (3s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: C. C. Martindale, S.J., *The Gospel According to Saint John* (7s.); Edward A. Sillem, *George Berkeley and the Proofs for the Existence of God* (21s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Erik Routley, *The Gift of Conversion* (18s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN: D. L. Munby, *Christianity and Economic Problems* (25s.); Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, *Where Judaism Differed* (31s. 6d.); Vincent Taylor, *The Cross of Christ* (10s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: J. I. Brice, *Beneath the Cross* (4s.); Charles Smyth (Ed.), *Good Friday at St Margaret's* (7s. 6d.); Miles Sargent, *The Sacrament of the Altar* [an exposition of the Prayer Book doctrine of the eucharist] (5s.); V. A. Demant, *A Two-Way Religion* (5s.); Mark Carpenter-Garnier, *Retreat to Advance* (5s.); P. M. Barry, *"Sir, we would see Jesus"* (4s.); Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker (Ed.), *St Aelred's Letter to his Sister* (5s.); Father Andrew, *The Light of the World* (4s.); Joost de Blank, *Members of Christ* (7s. 6d.); An Augustinian, *Meditations to the Holy Spirit* (4s.); S. C. Carpenter, *A Paraphrase of Ephesians* (3s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: J. R. Macphail, *The Bright Cloud* (15s.).

PENGUIN BOOKS: W. O. Lester Smith, *Education: an introductory survey* (3s. 6d.).

ST ALBERT'S PRESS (AYLESFORD, MAIDSTONE): Brocard Sewell, *Blessed Baptist of Mantua, Carmelite and Humanist*, 1447–1516 (2s.).

ST ANDREW'S CHURCH, PARIS, ILL., U.S.A.: G. E. Hoffman, *God of God, Light of Light* ($1.00).

ST ANDREW PRESS: William Barclay, *The Gospel of John* [2 vols] (12s., paper; 24s., cloth).

S.C.M. PRESS: Max Warren, *Partnership* (8s. 6d.); Amos N. Wilder, *New Testament Faith for To-day* (15s.); J. E. L. Oulton, *The Mystery of the Cross* (3s. 6d.); A Religious of C.S.M.V., *A Pocket-book for Christians* (1s.).

SHEED AND WARD: Raymond Hostie, S.J., *Religion and the Psychology of Jung* (16s.); John C. Heenan, *Confession* (3s. 6d.); Ronald Knox, *Bridegroom and Bride* (8s. 6d.).

TYNDALE PRESS: Leon Morris, *The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians* (7s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

PELAGIUS

An Historical and Theological Study

by

John Fergusson

Professor of Classics, University College, Ibadan.

15s. net

This work, awarded the Kaye Prize in the University of Cambridge in 1952, affords the first comprehensive study of Pelagius in English. Three introductory chapters set the general historical background, followed by an account of Pelagius' life in which recent research is reflected, and a systematic analysis of his thought on a scale never previously essayed.

HEFFER · CAMBRIDGE

" Dr C. K. Barrett has presented us with a book for which every teacher will be grateful, and which will be of inestimable profit to the general reader. He has given us a book of immense value." Expository Times.

THE NEW TESTAMENT BACKGROUND

Selected Documents

C. K. BARRETT **21s. net**

Professor C. F. D. Moule, reviewing the book in *View Review*, says, "It is fortunate that so fine a scholar as Dr Barrett has found time to render this signal service. . . . His terse introductions are of great value, and his cautious and scholarly comments are models of how to use evidence.

"This collection will open a new era in the teaching and study of New Testament background."

S·P·C·K

CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH

A. NYGREN **10s. 6d. net**

A study in the idea of the Messiahship in the New Testament and its basis in the Old, and of the significance of the idea for our understanding of the nature of the Church.

DISCIPLINES OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

E. HAYMAN **5s. net**

The life of prayer expounded as a process of learning the love of God, the humility, the obedience and the purity of Jesus, and of learning to share His pain.

THE PRAYER BOOK PATTERN

CAROLINE ADAMS **12s. 6d. net**

"It is refreshing to read a book designed to show that 'If the Prayer Book pattern is followed, God reigns supreme.' The book can be thoroughly recommended."
View Review

THE SEARCH FOR PERFECTION

W. R. MATTHEWS **8s. 6d. net**

The articles contributed to the Daily Telegraph by the Dean of St. Paul's are valued by many. Many others will also be glad to possess this selection from his articles.

THE WILL AND THE WAY

HARRY BLAMIRES **15s. net**

Faced with the tensions of the world's problems to-day, a man has ultimately only a choice between utter frustration and a belief in divine providence which results in an acceptance of vocation. It is of providence and vocation that Mr. Blamires writes. What he writes is always challenging, because he assumes that thinking should reach conclusions, and conclusions result in action. And his writing is always relevant, because through his work he knows the thoughts and feelings of the younger generation.

S · P · C · K